

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/611,799	KEAM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ARTHUR O. HALL	3714	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) ARTHUR O. HALL.

(2) Ningning Xu.

**Date of Interview:** 17 November 2009

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 103(a)

Claims discussed:

1, 23, and 31

Prior art documents discussed:

Shimakawa et al. (US7,275,987), DeStefano (US6,304,259), Logg (US4,738,451)

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Arthur O Hall/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 4:30 pm

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner again explained to applicants that the claims were replete with intended use statements that did not allow for patentable weight to be given to the function associated therewith.

Examiner also again described that claims 1 and 31 recited features not recited in claim 23 that potentially rendered the claims distinct, and that applicants would need to recite amendments that properly recite or remove recitation of the inventoried bag and hidden virtual objects of claim 23 in order to make the substantive features of claims 1, 23, and 31 non-distinct.

Examiner also stated that the character represented by the computer generation should be recited as a player character that is distinct from the plural virtual objects that are possessed by the player character, that the one or more other characters should be recited as non-player characters distinct from the player character, and that the inventory filter icon appeared to be selected by the player and does not perform the act of selecting.

Applicants will consider and provide the Examiner with draft proposed amendments that address the above stated issues in order to obviate further rejection under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Shimakawa, DeStefano and Logg.